



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,882	06/26/2003	Shivaram Bhat	03226.496001;P9015	7843
32615	7590	10/21/2008	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010			JOINSON, CARLTON	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2436		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/21/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
lord@oshaliang.com
hathaway@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/608,882	Applicant(s) Bhat et al.
	Examiner CARLTON V. JOHNSON	Art Unit 2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,8-11,17-20,23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,8-11,17-20,23,24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 7/28/2008 has been entered.

2. This action is responding to application papers filed **6-26-2003**. Claims **1, 2, 8 - 11, 17 - 20, 23, 24** are pending. Claims **1, 10, 11, 17, 19** have been amended. Claims **3 - 7, 12 - 16, 21, 22, 23, 25 - 32** have been cancelled. Claims **1, 10, 19** are independent.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot due to extensive amendments to claimed invention.

3.1 The Moriconi and Schneider prior art combination discloses identifying which resources are affected by policy changes. (see Schneider col. 24, lines 7-15; col. 24, lines 34-54: policy definition; information set (resource) for which access policy is defined (identifying information for resource))

The Moriconi prior art discloses processing global security policy information within a distributed environment utilizing server systems and processing locally and remotely managed security policy information for client systems. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-14; paragraph [0025], lines 1-7) The Moriconi prior art discloses the capability to send out a notification, or to distribute a set of updated version(s) of the security policy information. (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute updated policy information)

The Moriconi and Singhal prior art combination discloses a local storage and a remote storage source for security policy information, with the distributed environment of the Moriconi prior art disclosing the remote storage of security policy information. (see Moriconi paragraph [0046], lines 3-9: distributed network environment (i.e. client-server), remote source; see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: policy decision storage in local memory))

The terms, “*first request*”, “*second request*”, and “*third request*”, is not disclosed within the specification or the original claims. The term “*subsequent request*” is disclosed within the specification and the original claims. These terms indicate that there is no distinction between request(s). All requests are equal.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: **Claims 19, 20, 23, 24** are objected as “computer readable medium” is not defined clearly in the specification, so that the meaning of the term in the claims is not ascertainable by reference to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. **Claims 1, 10, 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no disclosure for invalidating said first policy decision based on said notification. The term, “invalidate”, is not disclosed within the specification or the original claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 9 - 11, 18 - 20, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Moriconi et al.** (US PGPUB No. 20030115322) in view of **Singhal et al.** (US PGPUB No. 20050021818) and further in view of **Schneider et al.** (US Patent No. 6,178,505).

With Regards to Claims 1, 10, 19, Moriconi discloses a method, computer-readable medium having computer-readable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein for causing a computer system to perform a method of controlling access to resources, said method comprising:

- a) receiving, by a server, a first request for a resource, said first request comprising
a first requestor identifying information, wherein said first requestor identifying
information identifies a first requestor; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified; paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium)
- b) referring, by said server, said first request to a remote source, wherein said
remote source evaluates said first request in response to said referring to
generate a first policy decision, wherein said first policy decision is based on a
policy definition governing access to said resource and based on said first
requestor identify information; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: process or evaluate access request; paragraph [0076], lines 16-19; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: policy definition processed locally or by local security policy, policy

definition local client security policy stored within local memory, access policy based on subject or requestor identification; paragraph [0017], lines 11-14: generate a policy decision)

- c) receiving, by said server, said first policy decision from said remote source, wherein said first policy decision is for said first requestor; (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified)
- e) receiving a second request for access to said resource, said second request comprising said first requestor identifying information; (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified)
- h) invalidating said first policy decision based on said notification; (see 112 rejection)
- i) receiving a third request for access to said resource, said third request comprising said second requestor identifying information, wherein said second requestor identifying information identifies said second requestor; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified)
- j) evaluating said third request using said second policy decision in said local memory, wherein said first policy decision is invalidated and said second policy decision is valid in local memory when said third request is evaluated; (see Moriconi paragraph [0076], lines 16-19: policy definition in local memory; paragraph [0047], lines 15-20: policy definition enforced based on local security

policy or locally)

- k) receiving, by said server, a fourth request for said resource after said third request is received, said fourth request comprising said first requestor identifying information, wherein said fourth requestor identifying information identifies said first requestor; identifying, by said server in response to said fourth request, said first policy decision as invalid; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified)
- l) referring, by said server, said fourth request to said remote source when the first policy decision is identified as invalid, wherein said remote source evaluates said fourth request in response to said referring to generate a third policy decision;
(see Moriconi paragraph [0017], lines 11-14: generate a policy decision)

Singhal discloses:

- d) storing said first policy decision for said resource in local memory, wherein said local memory further comprises a second policy decision, wherein said second policy decision is based on a second requestor identifying information, and wherein said second policy decision is for a second requestor identified by said second requestor identifying information; (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)
- f) evaluating said second request using said first policy decision in said local memory; (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: storage policy decision parameter in local memory)
- m) receiving, by said server, said third policy decision from said remote source (see

Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: policy decision storage in local memory)

(see Moriconi paragraph [0017], lines 11-14: generate a policy decision);

n) evaluating said fourth request subsequent request based on said third policy decision notification. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: storage policy decision parameter in local memory)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to process policy decision information as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6: “*... provide content providers 106, third party application providers 108 and partner portals 110 with more information about the user and network capabilities to enable provision of better services, inline context injection is done in the HTTP header by HTTP application handler 208 ...*”)

Schneider discloses:

g) receiving a notification from said remote source of a change in said policy definition, said notification identifying said first policy decision; (see Schneider col. 24, lines 7-15; col. 24, lines 34-54: policy definition; information set (resource) for which access policy is defined (identifying information for resource))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to process policy decision information as taught by Schneider. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Schneider in order

to make policy based access filters scalable by providing only as much authentication and encryption security as is required for a given user, a given path through the network, and a given resource. (see Schneider col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 3: *“... The aspect of making access filters scalable which is addressed by the claims attached hereto is that of providing only as much authentication and encryption security as is required for a given user, a given path through the network, and a given resource. ...”*)

With Regards to Claim 2, Moriconi discloses the method and computer usable medium of claims 1, wherein said resource is affiliated with another resource, and wherein further a policy decision for said other resource is received from said remote source and stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0056], lines 1-12: linked resources, policy for 2nd resource based on 1st resource) Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein a policy decision for said other resource. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of

better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

With Regards to Claims 9, 24, Moriconi discloses the method, computer usable medium of claims 1, 19 wherein a condition associated with said policy definition is also received from said remote source and stored locally, wherein said condition is enforced locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy transmitted to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0047], lines 17-20: policy enforced locally)

With Regards to Claim 11, Moriconi discloses the method and computer usable medium of claim 10, wherein said resource is affiliated with another resource, and wherein further a policy decision for said other resource is received from said remote source and stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0056], lines 1-12: linked resources, policy for 2nd resource based on 1st resource) Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein a policy decision for said other resource. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

With Regards to Claim 18, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 10 further comprising: receiving from said remote source a condition associated with said policy definition, wherein said condition is enforced locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0047], lines 15-20: policy definition enforced based on local security policy or locally)

With Regards to Claim 20, Moriconi discloses the method and computer usable medium of claim 19 wherein said resource is affiliated with another resource, and wherein further a policy decision for said other resource is received from said remote source and stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0056], lines 1-12: linked resources, policy for 2nd resource based on 1st resource) Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein a policy decision for said other resource. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of

better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

6. Claims 8, 17, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Moriconi-Singhal-Schneider** and further in view of **See et al.** (US PGPUB No. 20030021283).

With Regards to Claim 8, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said policy definition is valid is also received from said remote source and stored locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0081], lines 1-5: policy definition is valid; paragraph [0047], lines 15-20; paragraph [0076], lines 16-19: policy received, received and stored locally) Moriconi not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Moriconi-Singhal does not specifically disclose an expiration time for policy decision. However, See discloses wherein a period of time said policy information is valid. (see See paragraph [0009], lines 1-10: security policy information processing; paragraph [0042], lines 13-20: policy information with time based expiration condition or

period of time policy information valid)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi-Singhal to enable the usage of a period of time policy information is valid as taught by See. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of See in order for a network management platform that allows the making and enforcement of network management decisions over multiple network devices in an efficient and consistent manner. (see See paragraph [0008], lines 1-6: “*... Accordingly, what is desired is a network management platform that allows the making and enforcement of network management decisions over multiple network devices in an efficient and consistent manner. What is further desired is a network management platform that is scalable as the size of the network devices increases. ...*”)

With Regards to Claim 17, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 10 further comprising: receiving information that identifies said policy definition is valid. (see Moriconi paragraph [0081], lines 1-5: determine policy definition valid) Singhal does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of

better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Moriconi-Singhal does not specifically disclose an expiration time for policy decision. However, See discloses wherein a period of time said policy information is valid. (see See paragraph [0009], lines 1-10: security policy information processing; paragraph [0042], lines 13-20: policy information with time based expiration condition or period of time policy information valid)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi-Singhal to enable the usage of a period of time policy information is valid as taught by See. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of See in order for a network management platform that allows the making and enforcement of network management decisions over multiple network devices in an efficient and consistent manner. (see See paragraph [0008], lines 1-6)

With Regards to Claim 23, Moriconi discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 19 wherein a policy definition is valid, is also received from said remote source, and stored locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-6: policy definition, stored locally within local client security policy transmitted to a client) Singhal does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory or storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management

environment as taught by Singhal. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Moriconi-Singhal does not specifically disclose an expiration time for policy decision. However, See discloses wherein a period of time said policy decision is valid. (see See paragraph [0009], lines 1-10: security policy information processing; paragraph [0042], lines 13-20: policy information with time based expiration condition or period of time policy information valid)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi-Singhal to enable the usage of a period of time policy information is valid as taught by See. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of See in order for a network management platform that allows the making and enforcement of network management decisions over multiple network devices in an efficient and consistent manner. (see See paragraph [0008], lines 1-6)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nasser G Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2436

CVJ
October 1, 2008